REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Examiner's Office Action of September 29, 2009 issued in relation to the present Patent Application, the Applicants submit Amendments to the claims, and the below Remarks.

Claims 1-4, 8, 11, 14, 17 and 20 are presented for examination. Claim 1 is an independent claim.

Regarding 35 USC 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4, 11, 14, 17, 27-29, 33, 35 and 47 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lubow et al (US Pub. No. 2006/0118631) in view of Pinchen et al. (US 7,188,774) and in further view of Kurokawa (US 5,625,467).

Claims 3, 8, 32 and 34 are rejected as being unpatentable over Lubow et al in view of Pinchen et al., in further view of Kurokawa, and yet further in view of Klein (US Pub. No. 2001/0037248).

Claims 20 and 41 are rejected as being unpatentable over Lubow et al in view of Pinchen et al., Kurokawa, Klein, and further in view of Endoh (US 5,818,031).

Claims 27-29, 32-35, 41 and 47 have been cancelled from the application.

Kurokawa is relied upon for teaching a bar-code which is indicative of a respective position of the bar-code on a interface surface. Applicant respectfully disagrees

Kurokawa teaches font pattern data on a font pattern sheet. The entire font pattern sheet is raster scanned. The positions of the marks/dots arranged in the NxN matrix formation jointly encode a font pattern. Thus, the positional relationships between marks encode the font pattern. The positions of the marks are predefined within the matrix. The positional relationships are known from the raster scan. The marks alone, or in combination, do not encode a position on the sheet.

Independent claim 1 has been amended.

Furthermore, the prior art fails to teach coded data portions which encode a unique identity of the interface surface on which the coded data portion is printed, and the position of the coded data portion on that interface surface. The prior art also fails to teach a mapping the identities of the interface surfaces to product identity data.

In view of the foregoing it is submitted that claim 1, and all claims dependent on claim 1 are alowable.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's rejections have been traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:

_____
Kia Silverbrook

_____
Paul Lapstun

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
              393 Darling Street
              Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: patentdept@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762